



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,990	02/14/2000	Mahmoud R. Sherif	2-7	7379

30541 7590 07/19/2004
LAW OFFICE OF JOHN LIGON
505 HIGHLAND AVENUE
P.O. BOX 43485
UPPER MONTCLAIR, NJ 07043

EXAMINER

ZEWDU, MELESS NMN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2683

//

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/503,990	FEB 14, 2000	Sherif et al.	2-7
			Meless Zeudu
			EXAMINER
			2683 11
			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Meless Zeudu (3)

(2) John A. Litton (4)

Date of Interview: July 14, 2004 (35,938)

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Mainly claim 9, and to some extent claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: prior arts applied to dual reflectors
(no new prior art)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant intended to amend the claims (claims 9 & 1) with object dependent claims and later withdrew the proposal (citing client disapproval & it). Also discussed with whether 30c

see claim 14) is disclosed adequately. Examiner didn't think so.
Applicant had suggested to amend the spec. on the basis of fig. 8.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

FORM PTOL-413 (REV.1-86)

* There was a difference in interpretation